

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the case. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Independent Claims 1 and 8 are amended herein. Claims 17-20 are cancelled herein. No new matter has been added.

Support for the newly added features of Independent Claims 1 and 8 can be found at least on page 18, lines 18-23.

35 U.S.C. §102(a) – Claims 1-17

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Schneier (2002/0087882). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Applicants have amended Independent Claims 1 and 8 to include the feature “assigning a severity to said information based on an enterprise wide security policy.” Support for the newly added features of Independent Claims 1 and 8 can be found at least on page 18, lines 18-23.

Applicants do not understand Schneier to anticipate this claimed feature. MPEP §2131 provides:

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Applicants respectfully submit that Schneier fails to anticipate this claimed feature.

For this rational, Applicants submit that Independent Claims 1 and 8 and subsequently dependent Claims 2-7 and 9-16 are patentable over Schneier and Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) – Claims 17-20

Claims 17- 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Desai. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Applicants have cancelled Claims 17-20 herein. As such, Applicants believe the rejection to Claims 17-20 to be moot. Applicants respectfully request the rejection be removed.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-16 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER L.L.P.

Dated: 05/12/2008

/John P. Wagner, Jr./

John P. Wagner, Jr.  
Registration No. 35,398

Address:

WAGNER BLECHER LLP  
Westridge Business Park  
123 Westridge Drive  
Watsonville, California 95076  
(408) 377-0500

App. No.: 10/600,113

- 8 -

Examiner: Cervetti  
Art Unit: 2136